

Docket No.: 95-512



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

ACHARYA

Serial No.: 09/905,067

Filed: July 16, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2661

Examiner: WILSON, Robert W.

For: ARRANGEMENT FOR SWITCHING INFINIBAND PACKETS USING SWITCHING
TAG AT START OF PACKET

**REQUEST FOR CORRECTED OFFICE ACTION AND RESTARTING PERIOD FOR
REPLY UNDER MPEP §710.06**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Nonfinal Official Action mailed January 11, 2006, Applicant hereby requests that a Corrected Office Action be issued that corrects the errors identified below. Applicant further requests that the period for reply be restarted to begin with the mailing date of the Corrected Office Action in accordance with MPEP §710.06. This Request is being submitted within one month of the January 11, 2006 mailing date of the Nonfinal Office Action.

The January 11, 2006 Office Action contains the following errors that prevents Applicant from providing a complete response:

1) The Office Action fails to cite any authority requiring Applicant to provide a "full set of drawings". In fact, the drawings submitted November 28, 2005 are in compliance with 37 CFR §1.84(c) ("Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be

Request for Corrected Office Action filed February 10, 2006
Appln. No. 09/905,067
Page 1

identified as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to § 1.121(d)"). The drawings also are in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.121(d) ("Any changes to an application drawing must be in compliance with § 1.84 and must be submitted on a replacement sheet of drawings which shall be an attachment to the amendment document and, in the top margin, labeled "Replacement Sheet". Any replacement sheet of drawings shall include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is amended."

Hence, the objection should be withdrawn because there is no requirement to submit a "full set of drawings".

2) Claim 9 (which depends from claim 7) is not identified in the January 11, 2006 Office Action, as required under MPEP § 707.07(i). Hence, Applicant is unable to determine whether the claim was intended to recite allowable subject matter, or whether the claim was intended to be rejected under 35 USC § 103.

Hence, a Corrected Office Action is needed that (1) withdraws the objection to the drawings, and (2) specifies whether claim 9 is allowable or rejected.

Hence, Applicant hereby requests that a Corrected Office Action be issued and that the period for reply be restarted to begin with the mailing date of the Corrected Office Action in accordance with MPEP § 710.06.

Respectfully submitted,

Manelli Denison & Selter, PLLC




Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 20736
2000 M Street, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
(202) 261-1000

Facsimile (202) 887-0336

Date: ~~November 28, 2005~~

~~(November 26, 2005 = Saturday)~~


February 10, 2006

Request for Corrected Office Action filed February 10, 2006

Appln. No. 09/905,067

Page 2